



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Biblical Notes.

The Name Jerusalem. In a letter to the *Academy* of February 7, Professor Sayce makes known for the first time the origin of the name Jerusalem. A cuneiform tablet made us acquainted long ago with the fact that *uru* signifies "city," the Assyrian *alu*. Now the latter part of the name has been found in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, in which are preserved the letters which Ebed-tob, Governor of Jerusalem, sent to his suzerain the King of Egypt, a century before the Exodus. Salim, says Ebed-tob, was the name of the local deity worshipped on "the mountain of Jerusalem." Thus Uru-Salim, or Jerusalem, must be "the city of Salim," the god of peace. We can thus understand, adds Professor Sayce, why Melchizedek, the royal priest, is called "King of Salem" rather than of Jerusalem; and we may see in the title "Prince of Peace," conferred by Isaiah on the expected Saviour, a reference to the early history of the city in which he lived.

Exodus 14: 11. In his instructive article on "Otherworldliness in Ancient Egypt," Professor Moore calls attention to the prominence of the thought of death and the life beyond in the life of the ancient Egyptians. The Sphynx, Obelisks, Pyramids, Mummies, all refer to another world. Ruins of dwelling houses, residences of the rich, kings' palaces, have perished utterly. The people looked upon this life as a mere prelude to a future life. They lavished all their care upon their tombs. Hence it is that while the houses of the living have perished the houses of the dead are so glorious in their massiveness and so imperishable. Egypt is preëminently the land of tombs. What an emphasis therefore lies in the reproach of the Israelites against Moses in the verse referred to. They spoke in "grim irony" as they pointed back to the innumerable memorials of death in which the Egyptians gloried and which were the most conspicuous objects in any Egyptian landscape—"Because there were *no graves in Egypt*, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?"

The Future Life in Egypt and Israel. Professor Moore also notes the remarkable silence concerning the future life which Moses in the law preserves. The religion of the people by whom he was educated made much of it. The sanctions of Egyptian religion were drawn from the laws and penalties of the other world. He rarely refers to anything of the sort. It does not follow, however, that he believed in it less strongly or that he inculcated a less spiritual religion. The writer maintains that Egyptian religion by this exclusive occupation with the future life diverted the attention from the instructive connection between piety and prosperity in this life and vitiated the whole conception of religion and morality by introducing the motive of reward. We are inclined to think that he overstates the point somewhat and has scarcely presented an adequate reason for this strange contrast in the use of the idea of the future life by Moses and the Egyptians. For the conception of

religion and morality as followed by earthly prosperity, on which the religion of Israel insisted, contains just as evidently the prospect of reward and builds upon it just as emphatically as does that of Egypt. A plausible explanation recently urged is that the Old Testament writers were so familiar with the thought of the future life that they do not think it necessary to urge it and its sanctions as a motive to morality. They advance a step beyond the ideas of Egypt, accepting and building on all the former conceptions. They take it for granted that the people understand all about the subject and therefore may be led to what is in many respects a higher ground. Besides this important contrast between Hebrew and Egyptian thought, Professor Moore notes the monotheism inculcated by Moses and contrasts it most instructively with the polytheistic creed of Egypt.

The Song of Songs. In the *Evangelical Repository*, beginning with Jan. 1891 and still continuing, Dr. G. Lansing, long a missionary in Egypt, has been writing at length in explanation and comment upon the Song of Songs. His general theory of interpretation rejects any dramatic form of the poem on the ground that "the drama is not a Jewish or Semitic institution, nor the stage a Jewish invention." The three fundamental principles of his exposition he states as follows: (1) "We think the Song has a firm 'historical groundwork,' and that we must definitely settle its literal historical meaning, before we can begin to allegorize or spiritualize. (2) We do not in the whole book recognize any male speaker until in the last chapter. The whole dialogue is carried on between the daughters of Jerusalem and Shulamith, and when a male person is addressed, it is in the way of apostrophe to an absent one, and when one seems to speak it is a female who has put herself in his place by personification. (3) We believe that the literal meaning is the exhibition and commendation of pure connubial love between *one* man and *one* woman, as opposed to polygamy and the false love of the harem; and that the allegorical and spiritual meaning is the union of Jehovah to the individual soul of the believer, and to His spiritual Israel as opposed to the many gods of idolatry; and that there is also an historical thread running through the whole, from the calling of Israel to the coming of our Saviour." In the course of his detailed exposition Dr. Lansing has some very interesting and fresh considerations to offer upon special points on which he throws the light of personal, intimate and long-continued acquaintance with oriental life. Many would question the success of his endeavor to establish the three radical principles on which his exposition is based. The articles are worth careful reading.

The Feet Washing.—**John 13: 1-17.** Attention has often been called by commentators to the probability that the old hopes of temporal power for the Christ were dominant with the disciples at the last Passover time. The fact that they contended as to which should be the greatest (Lk. 22: 24) during the very course of the supper illustrates and strengthens the probability. Dr. Deems suggests, in his expository chapters on St. John's Gospel, that they quarrelled over the choice of seats at the table, who should have the seat of honor. This rivalry affords the occasion, according to some writers, for the exhibition of humility and service to others which Jesus gave in John 13. But Dr. Deems in an interesting paragraph calls attention to what may be a better explanation of this act of Jesus. The almost absolute necessity of